

1 Oct 69

Harold:

Here is a matter that I forgot to include in ~~my~~ the letter I sent most recently. It concerns the number 110669 and its possible relation to 19106.

In talking a while ago with a person who knew about codes, I learned that it was not possible to convert a 5-digit number into a 6-digit number without a key. That is, there is no cryptic system that can be applied unless you have reference to a particular key that applies only to the particular code being used. The result is that even if the two numbers are linked in the way I had suggested, there is no way of our knowing that they are linked-- at least not on the basis of the two numbers themselves.

It occurred to me recently that in considering this problem we are looking at the wrong thing. We are looking only at the two numbers, when we should be looking for the key that might make it possible for us ~~to convert the 5-digit number into the 6-digit~~ logically to convert the 5-digit number into the 6-digit.

I searched through all the pages of LHO's notebook, but could find nothing that I could apply to the numbers as a key. That ~~was~~ did not surprise me, for the key might have been in LHO's memory or even written down in some other place.

I think a search ought to be made of Shaw's address book. I would like to see the whole of the book-- all the pages and all writing on the covers. If you have a copy of the address book or can have a copy sent to me, would you please try to get it to my hands.

I don't know whether you have it or can get it, or whether you even want to probe this ~~xxx~~ matter further. Make up your own mind how much effort is justified. I think it much worth a look, for if there is a code involved, then Shaw would need a key much more than LHO would, and there is a possibility that the key is somewhere included in the same book that contains the relevant number. It's a very long shot, but a great gain if such an inquiry strikes pay dirt.

Let me know what you want to do with this, for I can't determine how much trouble it will be.

Still,

*nick*

Bernabei